

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application.

Claims 1 and 15-17 have been amended, claims 34-77 have been added and claims 13, 14 and 24-33 have been canceled without prejudice by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1 and 15-17 and new claims 34-77 do not introduce any new subject matter.

**DRAWING CHANGES**

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). The Examiner states that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims and that the means for securing the housing to an internal support structure of the seat recited in claim 24 must be shown or canceled from the claim(s).

Applicants have canceled claim 24 without prejudice, rendering the objection under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) moot. Applicants note, however, that the means for securing the housing to an internal support structure of the seat is described in the specification at page 7, line 21 to page 8, line 7 and shown by, for example, reference numerals 204 and 206 in amended Fig. 4, Fig. 6A and amended Fig. 6B. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the objection under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(p)(4) because the reference character "205" has been used to designate both the headrest in Fig. 3 and screws in Figs. 4 and 6B. In response to the objection, Applicants propose to amend Figs. 4 and 6B by changing the reference numeral "205" to --204-- so as to avoid the dual designation. Furthermore, Applicants have amended the specification at page 7, line 23 to change the reference number corresponding to the screws from 205

to 204.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(p)(5) because they do not include reference character 310 mentioned in the description. In response to the objection, Applicants propose to amend Fig. 4 by adding reference numeral 310.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84, Applicants file herewith replacement drawing sheets for amended Figs. 4 and 6B, which have been labeled "Replacement Sheet".

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner objects to claims 14 and 18-21 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and indicates that claims 14 and 18-21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. Applicants note the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 14 and 18-21.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Examiner's objection to claims 14 and 18-21 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In response to the Examiner's objection, Applicants have canceled claims 13 and 14 and rewritten independent claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 14 and to include the limitations of claim 13 from which claim 14 depended.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18 and 21 have been rewritten in independent form as new claims 34 and 56, respectively.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that, in light of the amendment made to independent claim 1 and the addition of new claims 34 and 56, Applicants respectfully

request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 14 and 18-21.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-12, 15-17 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,267,775 ("Nguyen"), claims 13 and 24-33 having been canceled. Applicants note that the cancellation of claims 13 and 24-33 does not constitute an admission that claims 13, 24-33 are anticipated by Nguyen.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of allowable claim 14 and intervening claim 13. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Nyguen and is condition for allowance. Claims 2-12, 15-17 and 22-23 depend from claim 1, which, for the reasons stated hereinabove, is submitted not to be anticipated by the cited reference. For at least those very same reasons, claims 2-12, 15-17 and 22-23 are also submitted not to be anticipated by the cited reference.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-12, 15-17 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and that claims 1-12, 15-17 and 22-23 are in condition for allowance.

**NEW CLAIMS**

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 34-77 are patentable over the cited reference and respectfully request that the Examiner allow new claims 34-77. New independent claims 34 and 56 respectively include the allowable subject matter of claims 18 and 21 rewritten in independent form. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 34 and 56 and claims 35-55 and 57-77 respectively dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, it is suggested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

*Michael F. Morano*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael F. Morano  
Reg. No. 44,952  
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, NY 11797  
(516) 692-8888